impacts business production orders more than it does consumer orders. Mindy also stated that business will likely be in production by the first week of May, 1998. Pat Rand and Sally Strain will look at alternate options and provide a firm date. Pat Rand will provide a status on 4/20/98. Linda Mull will work issue within AT&T to determine feasibility of manually ordering these listing types.				Stephen Travers will also verify if BST will handle the clarification, if applicable, until such time that it implements the fix. Stephen Travers will provide BSTs response 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST will be prepared to provide a response on 5/6/98 which will include verification as to whether or not these orders would go into clarification. Linda Mull restated that we need to be prepared to discuss optional interim solutions. 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that he has requested that BST assess if the orders impacted by these issues (006, 008, 015) will reject or be put in clarification and whether or not it can implement workarounds at its center to address these issues until BSTs fix can be implemented. Stephen Travers stated that he expects BSTs response to be finalized by the end of this week (5/8/98). *Stephen Travers stated that BSTs 7/24/98 release also allows BST to process JB REQTYPE and that he will clarify if this means R ACTivity type with JB REQTYPE.* Stephen Travers also stated that this release also includes the ability for BST to generate USOCs. Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T can issue an order for listings without USOCs today, but that *BST will not bill for the listings until the enhancement is implemented.* Stephen Travers agreed with Mindy's statement. Mindy Diamond requested that BST revisit these fixes and determine if BST can provide an earlier fix than 7/24/98 for the item considered AT&T's highest priority (the asterisk). Mindy Diamond stated AT&T's priority in the following order *, R, /LA, and +. Mindy Diamond stated that many customers would have multiple listed addresses, but that these orders would be done manually. *Stephen Travers will determine if BST can pull up the * fix prior to 7/24/98 and will provide AT&T an update by 5/8/98.*

					05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that BSTs 7/24/98 release date is firm and that BST would not stagger release of the prioritized components. Stephen Travers also stated that BSTs LCSC said the impacted orders need to be sent manually. Kathy Taber requested that Pam Nelson and Ray Crafton work these issues at their levels. 05/12/98: Linda Mull stated AT&T's position that BST did not implement these issues according to our previous agreement and BST will not be implementing its fix for these issues until 7/24/98. Therefore, BST must accept these orders electronically from AT&T, without any related rejection or clarification, and handle any resulting interim process at BST. 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that she has no updates, but that Jan Burris is working these issues. Tohsa Ervin stated that BST will accommodate AT&T sending these orders manually. Tosha Ervin stated that she has no idea when she will get feedback from Jan. Linda Mull stated that AT&T will not be sending these orders to BST manually and that AT&T expects BST to implement a process on its side to handle these orders until its 7/24 release is implemented. Pam Nelson stated that Quinton Sanders already said BST will handle these issues manually and that she will talk to Quinton to ensure clarity. Tosha Ervin stated that BST escalated these issues in order to advance the 7/24 release date and to develop BSTs solution for its workaround. Nancy Shawcross stated that she and Tosha were not aware of Quinton's agreement for BST to handle these issues on its side. 05/20/98: Tosha Ervin stated that she has not gotten feedback from Jan Burris. Tosha stated that she will check with Jan regarding status of these issues. Linda Mull clarified that the two items which need to be addressed are (1) Can BST advance the 7/24/98 release?, and (2) Ensure that BST knows AT&T will not be sending these orders manually and that AT&T expects BST to handle any manual, interim process on its side.

| 019 | Electronic Ordering Business Rules - AT&T restated its request that BST include ALL DL business rules in the business rules manual. BSTs latest drafts (provided in the 4/98 meetings) have the manual ordering rules split out from the electronic ordering section. AT&T requested that BST provide these same type rules, where applicable, for electronic ordering. Nancy Shawcross will take issue back internally to determine how BST will include these rules in its documentation. No date for closure provided. | 4/16/98 | Stephen Travers | | 04/29/98: Memo from Tosha Ervin stating the date for providing these is still being negotiated. She will provide a target delivery date NLT 5/5/98.

05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST is dividing up the responsibility for the Directory Listing Electronic Ordering Business Rules documentation. Stephen Travers stated that BST will have a commitment date by 5/8/98 as to who will provide the information, what will be provided, and when it will be provided.

05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST is on track for its 5/8/98 deliverable.

05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that he expects BSTs response by Friday, 5/8/98.

05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that BSTs commitment date will not be available until 5/12/98 a.m.

05/12/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST has escalated this issue to Jan Burris, but does not have a target date for delivery at this time. Tosha Ervin stated the issue is "when" BST will provide this information and not "if" BST will provide this information. Tosha stated that she is awaiting Jan's response.

05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that there is no date available as to when the documentation will be provided and that the issue has been taken to higher levels within downstream departments.

05/20/98: Tosha Ervin stated that ALL outstanding DL business rule documentation will be provided 5/26/98. Tosha Ervin and Linda Mull will hold a call on 5/21/98 to ensure both AT&T and BST are in agreement as to the expected changes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

					05/28/98: Tosha Ervin stated that for every listing type where the business rules document shows "see manual rules" that all manual rules related to that listing type apply. Tosha Ervin stated that she is working on an electronic version of the business rules. 06/02/98: Linda Mull stated that she received the BST business rules last Thursday afternoon (5/28/98) and that they are currently being reviewed by AT&T.
021	Pat Rand will add a business rule indicating that for AC, the listing must be ordered by the same service provider as the associated listing service provider.	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: No udpate has been provided. 06/26/98: BST has not yet, but will add a note to the business rules document (as agreed to on 4/16/98), page 38 of section 4B, as follows: The Alternate Call request must be ordered by the owner of the called to number. BST agreed to provide this documentation by 6/29/98. NOTE: Tosha Ervin faxed a copy of updated page 38 with revision date of 6/26/98. AT&T is awaiting an electronic version of these same updates.
024	Section 4A, Page 11 - Pat Rand will include a closed parentheses in the EDI column for DST. Pat Rand will add a note that "See" is the only word allowed to follow DST	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: No update has been provided. 06/26/98: Pat Rand will add a second note on page 11 of the electronic examples stating "See" is the only word allowed to follow DST. BST will provide this update by 6/29/98. NOTE: Tosha Ervin faxed a copy of the updated page 11 with revision date of 6/26/98. AT&T is awaiting an electronic version of these same updates.
025	Section 4A, Page 16 - Pat Rand will add "Dr" as shown on the listing on page 15.	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: No update has been provided.
026	Pat Rand will test to verify that what AT&T is sending today will work for designer listings (Can BST accept 3	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: Memo from Tosha Ervin stating BST will provide an answer to this issue by 5/1/98.

REFNUMs on a new order OR 6 REFNUMs on a change order?).				5/4/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST testing of designer listings is underway today and that thus far, the orders have flowed through EDI successfully. Stephen Travers also stated that BST is following the orders downstream now and that BST should have the rest of the process verified by the end of the day today. Stephen Travers stated he will provide results to Linda Mull by 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that he is still awaiting test results and hopes to receive those today (5/5/98). 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that these issues have been escalated from Jan Burris to Peggy Caldwell as no response was received within BST. Stephen Travers stated that BST does not have a date for a response at this time, but that he will provide an update tomorrow. 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that the results should be available 5/14/98. 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that the tests were run and went through. Tosha stated that she needs to speak to Gloria about the results. 05/20/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Gloria Burr did not receive the test results last week and that Gloria put the tests in again this morning. Tosha Ervin will provide the test results on 5/21/98. 05/28/98: Tosha Ervin stated that she has tried to obtain test results from Diane Jones and Vanessa Thomas and that we will have to wait for Gloria Burr to return on 6/1/98 to obtain results. 06/02/98: Tosha Ervin stated that the BST Designer Listing test results are not available yet.

					06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BSTs tests have not yet been run. BST plans to run these tests on 6/26/98 with results to be provided to AT&T on 6/29/98. NOTE: On 7/9/98, Tosha Ervin stated that Pat Rand has run these tests, but is awaiting concurrence from another BST source to ensure test results are accurate.
27	Section 4A, Pages 17, 19 and 21 - Pat Rand will add a note to this example stating the example is to depict adding "skier" to the existing listing as this example does not reflect our agreement regarding adding both Picard and skier unless this example is provided to reflect the current agreement as shown in Mindy's example above.	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: BST update not yet provided. 06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Pat Rand will update the EDI example and mapping (as originally agreed to on 4/16/98) and will provide this by 6/29/98. NOTE: Tosha Ervin faxed a copy of updated pages 17 and 18 with revision date of 6/26/98. AT&T is awaiting an electronic version of these same updates.
030	Section 4A, Pages 29 and 31 - For all FAC, FCR, and FL listing types, Pat Rand will change the notation at the bottom of the page as follows: In Georgia directories, the address cannot be completely omitted from Foreign Listings, "except for foreign cross reference listings".	4/16/98	Pat Rand		04/29/98: BST update not yet provided. 06/26/98: FCR example is okay. Tosha Ervin stated that BST will update the FAC example. BST will update page 51 to show exactly what must be included for address.
037	ALI Codes - Linda Mull to investigate as to whether or not IDF requires the use of ALI codes. Kathy Massey stated that AT&T does NOT need ALI codes when manually ordering directory listings. The issues surrounds the concerns of not using ALI. These concerns were as follows: 1) how can we ensure BST identifies the appropriate listing, 2) who is responsible if the advertising is incorrect, AT&T, BST or BAPCO?, and 3) if used, where is the ALI code placed? *Linda Mull will contact BST if AT&T will be using ALI on the manual form and where it will be populated.*	4/16/98	Linda Mull		04/29/98: AT&T reviewing ALI code manual example provided by BST.
038	Linda Mull will check the BAPCO guide to determine if an all inclusive list exists depicting which words are alphabetized in the spelled in full version. If an exclusive list is not included in the BAPCO guide, Linda Mull will	4/16/98	Mull and Barretto		04/29/98: No detail exists in the BAPCO guide. Linda Mull sent memo to Rook Baretto on 5/1/98.

	contact Rook Baretto for the list.				
039	Pages 50 and 58 - Dual Name Listings and Stylist Service Listings - Kathy Massey will remove the notes indicating that dual name and stylist service listings must be ordered manually.	4/16/98	Kathy Massey		04/29/98: No update has been provided by BST.
041	Stephen Travers will verify when the updates agreed upon during the 4/16/98 meeting will be provided for the Directory Listing Business Rules manual. Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to have an update by 5/6/98.	5/4/98	Stephen Travers		05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that he will provide a date tomorrow (5/6/98). 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that he was given 5/26/98 as the date BST will provide Business Rules updates from the 4/3/98 and 4/16/98 meetings. Linda Mull requested that BST provide the documentation in electronic version. Stephen Travers stated BST would provide this information electronically. 05/08/98: No change.
042	BST will provide update in the DL business rules manual showing how to order Stylist Listings electronically using /PCN.	5/8/98	Pat Rand		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Pat Rand will change an exhibit to show how to order stylist listings with /PCN (as promised on 5/8/98). BST will provide this by 6/29/98. NOTE: As of 7/9/98, this has not yet been provided.
043	USOCs - Stephen Travers responded to the question "will AT&T be able to process directory listings orders without USOCs before 7/24/98 (BSTs release 3.0)". Stephen Travers stated that for those list type codes where AT&T does not send USOCs today, the order would have to be processed manually. Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T was told not to send USOCs, therefore, AT&T just removed USOCs from its coding and now we are being told we should send USOCs. Stephen Travers stated the decision was put into AT&T's hands as to whether or not to send USOCs and that Mindy	5/11/98	Stephen Travers		05/12/98: Linda Mull stated AT&T's position that BST did not implement these issues according to our previous agreement and BST will not be implementing its fix for these issues until 7/24/98. Therefore, BST must accept these orders electronically from AT&T, without any related rejection or clarification, and handle any resulting interim process at BST. Linda Mull read the minutes recorded at the 4/16/98 meeting with BST as follows: "AT&T will discontinue sending Directory Listing USOCs (date undefined at this time). When AT&T moves to Issue 7 code for ADL, AT&T will NOT be sending USOCs. For consumer, Issue 7, AT&T will continue sending USOCs until early

Diamond said "no" at the 4/16/98 meeting. Pam Nelson stated the USOC issue began before 4/16/98. Linda Mull stated that Nancy Shawcross' (BST) action item log provided at the 4/16/98 meeting was updated to reflect that AT&T will not be sending USOCs and that the issue was closed without development of an interim process. Mindy Diamond clarified that BST originally requested USOCs and that AT&T objected to sending USOCs because this was not consistent with industry plans. Mindy Diamond stated that the USOC issue was taken to the Steering Committee where AT&T was told that there was only one condition where BST will convert to the appropriate USOC based upon the listing text. Mindy Diamond stated that the latest version of the BST business rules document (provided 4/3/98) contained an assumption that AT&T would NOT send USOCs. (NOTE: The assumption is documented in BSTs business rules manual as follows: AT&T will not send listing USOCs. If USOCs are sent, double billing may occur.) In summary, Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T fought to NOT send USOCs, and then implemented sending them based upon BSTs requirements which BST itself changed concurrent with delivery of its business rules manual. Mindy Diamond stated that BST then said AT&T could decide to either send or not send USOCs and AT&T believed by not sending USOCs it was in synch with how BST had coded. Stephen Travers stated that BST can support AT&T not sending USOCs as of 7/24/98. *Pam Nelson stated that BST needs to accept and work the orders without directory listing USOCs as AT&T will not be sending these orders manually. Stephen Travers stated that he will escalate this issue and it will likely be Wednesday (5/13/98) before BST can respond.* Stephen Travers also stated that he doubts he will come back with a different answer as BST has already been				May (date dependent upon resolution of open issues). Both teams agreed the USOC issue is closed and that no interim solution is required." 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that she has no updates, but that Jan Burris is working these issues. Tohsa Ervin stated that BST will accommodate AT&T sending these orders manually. Tosha Ervin stated that she has no idea when she will get feedback from Jan. Linda Mull stated that AT&T will not be sending these orders to BST manually and that AT&T expects BST to implement a process on its side to handle these orders until its 7/24 release is implemented. Pam Nelson stated that Quinton Sanders already said BST will handle these issues manually and that she will talk to Quinton to ensure clarity. Tosha Ervin stated that BST escalated these issues in order to advance the 7/24 release date and to develop BSTs solution for its workaround. Nancy Shawcross stated that she and Tosha were not aware of Quinton's agreement for BST to handle these issues on its side. 05/20/98: Tosha Ervin stated that she has not gotten feedback from Jan Burris. Tosha stated that she will check with Jan regarding status of these issues. Linda Mull clarified that the two items which need to be addressed are (1) Can BST advance the 7/24/98 release?, and (2) Ensure that BST knows AT&T will not be sending these orders manually and that AT&T expects BST to handle any manual, interim process on its side.

	pressing hard on this issue.				
044	Tosha Ervin stated that BST will include its agreement to accept I and O ACT values for manual ordering in the business rules manual agreements section.	5/12/98			06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BSTs preference is that AT&T use A and D for adding and deleting on manual orders, but that BST will accept I and O. However, Tosha stated that BST wants AT&T to change it M&Ps to submit A and D in lieu of I and O on manual orders. Tosha stated that BST will NOT include a business rule reflecting its earlier request for I and O, and asked AT&T to revisit this issue and begin sending A and D. Tosha also stated that BST will not reject manual orders sent with I and O. Linda Mull stated that AT&T is sending I and O at BSTs earlier request. Linda Mull will forward this issue to AT&T team.
046	Tosha Ervin stated she will determine if BST can provide the REQTYPE matrix electronically.	05/28/98	Tosha Ervin		
047	BST will determine (for LNP) if it can set up a single account for listings regardless of the source of the number for LNP.	6/9/98	Stephen Travers		
048	BST will provide LNP EDI ordering requirements, account structure information, and BSTs LNP implementation schedule (both current view and future updates).	6/9/98	Stephen Travers		
049 X050	Pat Rand will determine if an order will encounter a fatal error or go into clarification if the LOCBAN does NOT equal the BST BTN, but is one of the numbers being ported. Also, Pat will determine if any cross referencing is done within BSTs systems and if 7020 is the error that would be returned.	6/9/98	Pat Rand		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST testing is underway and that BST is analyzing the results.
050 X049	By 6/22/98, Pat Rand will determine if (1) BST can identify a telephone number as a BST telephone number or if it would reject with a fatal error 7020 and if (2) BST can accept C at the account level, V at the line level, use only 1	6/9/98	Pat Rand		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that based on BSTs position that subsequent migrations must be submitted manually or on 2 related orders, that this issue is a moot point. However, Tosha stated that she will determine if this scenario was tested and/or discussed at

	order, and have 2000 as the account number in LOCBAN (the new ported account number). If so, this would negate the need to use remarks. Marcia Moss stated that she doesn't believe this would be a quick fix, but that BST would investigate.				BST.
051	By 6/22/98, Pat Rand and Marcia Moss will determine feasibility and best potential implementation date of the following: REQTYPE = C, ORDER LEVEL = C, LOCBAN = "to" number, Relaxing the main listing requirement due to this being a change order, and finally, LINE LEVEL = V (migrate), causing clarification fallout. Stephen Travers stated the account team will provide BSTs written response to AT&T.	6/9/98	Pat Rand and Marcia Moss		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that based on BSTs position that subsequent migrations must be submitted manually or on 2 related orders, that this issue is a moot point. However, Tosha stated that she will determine if this scenario was tested and/or discussed at BST.
052	AT&T and BST will revisit the issue of viable methods to force clarifications, to determine if there are any other possible options (other than LOCBAN and slash in remarks).	6/9/98	AT&T and BST		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST has no other alternate options to suggest for forcing a clarification. Linda Mull will discuss with AT&T internal team.
053	By 6/22/98, Pat Rand and Marcia Moss will determine if BST can/will use a clarification error (slash in remarks, LOCBAN trigger, or other) and a rep reading remarks for subsequent port activity. This process would eliminate the need for two LSRs. Mindy Diamond stated that the two order process proposed by BST is also a manual process.	6/9/98	Pat Rand and Marcia Moss		06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that based on BSTs position that subsequent migrations must be submitted manually or on 2 related orders, that this issue is a moot point. However, Tosha stated that she will determine if this scenario was tested and/or discussed at BST.
002 X033	Tosha will work with Gloria Burr and Diane Jones to determine if BST can convert the list code LN to FL based on the FDN. BST will also provide instructions on how to order other list types when using an AT&T assigned number (e.g., non-pub or non-list). Tosha will provide BSTs response to AT&T on 4/7/98.	4/3/98	Tosha Ervin	CLOSED	04/16/98: BST will provide a list detailing which list codes should be sent with AT&T assigned number orders for all listing types. 4/29/98: BST provided list detailing which list codes to provide with AT&T assigned number orders for all listing types. 05/04/98: AT&T will be sending FL on AT&T assigned number orders, therefore conversion is a moot issue. Per Mindy Diamond,

					this issue is closed. ISSUE CLOSED.
003 X004 X012	Section 2, Page 4, Item 3 - Mindy Diamond stated that R has never been a condition of JB REQTYPE and that BSTs own documentation shows that R is not required: Mindy will provide PON numbers and BST reject book reference.	4/3/98	Mindy Diamond	CLOSED	04/16/98: Mindy Diamond stated she would provide the documentation referenced. 05/28/98: Louise Del Monaco stated that the REQTYPE matrix provided by BST looks okay. Mindy Diamond stated that these issues can be closed (003 and 012). ISSUES CLOSED.
004 X003 X012	Section 2, Page 4, Item 3 - Mindy Diamond stated that R has never been a condition of JB REQTYPE and that BSTs own documentation shows that R is not required: BST is to identify where uniquenesses occur based upon REQTYPE.	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: BST has not yet provided this detail. 05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that Pat Rand is circulating a draft of the requested information and that Pat Rand gave a commitment date of 5/11/98 to hand off the information to Stephen Travers who will provide to Linda Mull on 5/11/98. Stephen Travers also stated he will provide status/date on 5/5/98 as to whether or not there are any negative implications to AT&T not sending R in ACTivity for REQTYPE EB. CLOSED to be worked with issues 003 and 012.
005	Pat Rand will investigate if a BST internal solution is available to ensure AT&T is not double billed when USOCs are sent. Tosha Ervin will take issue and ensure AT&T receives a letter from BST stating the change in policy.	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: AT&T will not be sending directory listing USOCs. ISSUE CLOSED.
007	Section 3, Page 9, Item 7 - AT&T coded to send @ in the listed address when appropriate. BST will ensure there is no problem with AT&T sending the @ when street number does not apply.	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	4/16/98: Pat Rand will verify that BST can accept the @ when street number is omitted on listed address. 05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated BSTs response will be provided 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that he is awaiting Pat Rand's confirmation on 5/6/98. 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that Kathy Massey provided the following response: BST will place an @ if appropriate on indefinite addresses. The CLEC will provide AHN from RSAG with the

					Alternate House Number (AHN). Mindy Diamond clarified that If no number is on the address, AT&T inserts an @, therefore if a customer says "Empire State Building" AT&T would use Empire State Building. Mindy also stated that if the customer has 1 Empire State Building, AT&T would still use @ Empire State Building. *Stephen Travers stated that he would take Mindy's response back to Kathy Massey and provide a response by Friday 5/8/98.* 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that he has not yet received Pat Rand's response. Stephen Travers stated that he will attempt to get Pat Rand on the next call (5/11 or 5/12), but hopes to have an answer by Monday 5/11/98. Stephen Travers will forward the business rules in writing. 05/11/98: Stephen Travers stated that regarding Mindy Diamond's example of Empire State Building, if there is no AHN and AT&T uses an @, BST will accept the @ and not duplicate the @. Mindy Diamond stated the issue can be closed. ISSUE CLOSED.
010	Section 3, Page 12, Item 12 - Listed Tel No vs Acct Tel No. The agreement stated in the manual is correct, but requires BST clarification. AT&T is not sending /PN in feature detail. Pat Rand will validate that BST puts a /PN in S&E section of service order. If not, there will be an additional action item required.	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that Pat Rand did confirm that BST does put a /PN in the S&E section. ISSUE CLOSED.
011	Linda Mull and Tosha Ervin will have a conference call on Monday to discuss agreements reached which are not reflected in the most recent DL business rules document. BST will incorporate these items and there will be a follow up joint team conference call to discuss.	4/3/98	Mull and Ervin	CLOSED	04/20/98: Call Completed. ISSUE CLOSED.
012 X003 X004	Section 3, Page 12, Item 14 - BST to provide AT&T ALL conditions on when to send activities A, D, and R relative to REQTYPES JB, EB, and CB. Pat Rand will develop matrix	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: BST provided status during 4/16/98 meeting that Pat Rand is working on this action item. No targeted completion date provided.

and provide to Mindy Diamond for review. Also, AT&T is not planning to send R in ACT for REQTYPE EB. BST will review and provide implications, if any.				05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that Pat Rand is circulating a draft of the requested information and that Pat Rand gave a commitment date of 5/11/98 to hand off the information to Stephen Travers who will provide to Linda Mull on 5/11/98. Stephen Travers also stated he will provide status/date on 5/5/98 as to whether or not there are any negative implications to AT&T not sending R in ACTivity for REQTYPE EB. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that Pat Rand is on track for her 5/11/98 deliverable. Stephen Travers also stated that an answer is pending from Pat Rand as to whether or not there are any negative implications to AT&T not sending R in ACTivity for REQTYPE EB. 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that BSTs 5/11/98 deliverable is still on track. 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that Stephen Travers stated that the matrix is due 5/11/98. Stephen Travers also stated that Beverly Simmons was provided the rationale for R (record) vs. C (change) activity being that C is more expensive and R is more appropriate. Vera Clements and Louise Del Monaco clarified that earlier joint discussions pertained to R for JB REQTYPE with directory only orders and AT&T was told that R would go directly to BAPCO. Stephen Travers asked AT&T to restate the open question. Louise Del Monaco stated the question as follows: For EB, CB, and JB REQTYPES, which activity type should AT&T send? Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T has a matrix for the various activity levels and that AT&T needs this to include each REQTYPE. Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T will not send R in ACT for REQTYPE EB. Vera Clements stated that AT&T needs to know the implications of using C vs. R and if AT&T sends R with REQTYPE JB, will this remove the miscellaneous account number issue as the miscellaneous account number issue should go away if orders flow

					directly to BAPCO. Stephen Travers will attempt to get an answer by COB on 5/11/98.
					05/11/98: Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to have the matrix to Linda Mull this evening or by 5/12/98 a.m.
					Stephen Travers stated that regarding BSTs 7/24/98 3.0 release, it will support processing of R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE. Mindy Diamond asked if this was valid now. *Stephen Travers stated that he will verify with Pat Rand if this is valid now.*
					Stephen Travers stated that if AT&T sends an R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE, this will NOT remove the miscellaneous account number issue, but that a CLEC can submit their telephone number and the LSR will drop to the service rep for manual handling. Stephen Travers also stated that BST needs to address how to send the order without an approved/tested product and process. Stephen Travers stated there is no approved product today for this *type of* request. Stephen Travers stated there is an issue of conversion at a later date to build this appropriately. Vera Clements stated that with the R ACTivity, these orders go straight to BAPCO. Louise Del Monaco stated that Beverly Simmons told her that after testing the issue, with an R ACTivity type, the order would pass all provisioning edits and go straight to BAPCO. Pam Nelson asked Stephen Travers what product this created. Mindy Diamond gave an example of how today if a customer within SBC territory wanted a listing in a BST directory, the customer would call BST to do this and therefore this should not be a new process. *Stephen Travers stated he will give the questions to Pat Rand tonight (1) Does BST support R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE today, and (2) What new product is created by an R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE for AT&T assigned number orders with listings only.*
					05/12/98: Pat Rand stated that the R ACTivity with a JB REQTYPE is available today, but that BST doesn't have this in place to

					generate USOCs. Pat Rand also stated that BST has verified the EB and FB REQTYPES for resale. Pat Rand stated that BST generates USOCs with activity levels of V, W, C, and A and in these cases, AT&T can submit an order electronically and that BST will generate USOCs. Tosha Ervin stated that JB orders using R ACTivity do NOT bypass edits at BST. Tosha Ervin stated these orders are subject to the same edits as any other orders. Tosha Ervin clarified that R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE is not a product. Tosha Ervin stated the matrix BST is preparing is a multi-departmental task. Tosha Ervin stated that BST's draft has gone to the 2nd department for review and concurrence. *Tosha stated that BST expects the 2nd departments' response by Friday, 5/15/98, and that if there are no concerns or issues, BST will provide the matrix by close of business 5/15/98. Tosha stated that if there are concerns, BST will give its projected date for completion on 5/15/98.* 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Pat Rand's draft has been reviewed by the necessary folks within BST and that the matrix is ready. Tosha stated that AT&T should have the matrix by Wednesday of next week (5/20/98). Tosha stated the reason for the delay is to allow BST to make any necessary formatting changes. 05/20/98: Tosha Ervin stated that the matrix is complete and will be sent to AT&T today. 05/28/98: Louise Del Monaco stated that the REQTYPE matrix provided by BST looks okay. Mindy Diamond stated that these issues (003 and 012) can be closed. ISSUES CLOSED.
013	Section 4A, Page 2 - BST to provide detail on this EDI content issue. What gets put into TN field? What TN does	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: BST will generate the /PN on RingMaster services. Per Mindy Diamond, this issue is closed.

	order get issued on? How are we going to handle this?				
014 X006	BST will have fix in place to handle AT&T business listings electronically without the use of an asterisk (for reversal of normal capitalization rules) as of 5/29/98. Pat Rand will attempt to move up the BST 5/29/98 date for fix. Linda Mull will talk to Art Soderberg regarding AT&T's position on sending business orders requiring an asterisk manually until 5/29/98.	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: Combined with like issue #006. Issue 014 closed.
016 X008	Section 3, Page 9, Agreement #9 - "+" lineal descent - BST has only coded for lineal descent for Jr., Sr., and III. This issue affects both business and consumer orders until BST fix in place. BST will provide date for fix by 4/20/98. BST fix will address 2nd, 3rd, 4th, II, and IV. Until fix is in place, IV will publish at end of name as Iv (uppercase I and lowercase v) and 2nd will reject. By 4/20/98, BST to provide date when fix will be in place. By 4/20/98, Kathy Massey to verify if alpha numeric combinations will reject within BST or if they will publish incorrectly (e.g., 2nd).	4/3/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/16/98: Issue to be addressed with open issue #008. This issue is closed to be worked with 008.
017	Kathy Massey will include the default rules for use of PLA with a number in the listed name in the business rules document.	4/16/98	Kathy Massey	CLOSED	04/29/98: BST has not yet provided this update. 06/17/98: E-mail from Marilyn Antal to Louise Del Monaco stating AT&T has reviewed the wording in the 5/26/98 version of the BST DL Business rules document. ISSUE CLOSED.
018 X009	ALI Codes - BST (Kathy Massey and Nancy Shawcross for Tosha Ervin) doesn't recall the agreement reached that AT&T would provide its own ALI code on consumer orders. Linda Mull shared a copy of a 1/98 DL meeting summary with BST. This summary clearly states that agreement was reached that AT&T would provide its own ALI codes on consumer orders. This issue does not affect business listings BST will discuss the ALI code agreement	4/16/98	Tosha Ervin	CLOSED	04/16/98: ISSUE CLOSED to be worked in connection with issue 009.

	with its Steering Committee Team members for further direction.				
020	Section 3, Page 12, Agreement #15 - Mindy Diamond stated the previous agreement with BST was that BST would ignore /dgn in the listed name field, but BST stated it also ignores the designation itself. AT&T uses /dgn with designations, therefore listings already submitted for embedded base need to be verified. BST needs a comma for consumer and business when designation used as title of address. The example provided by Kathy Massey is: Smith, Robert, Esq/dgn atty. Kathy Massey stated the business rule to be that there is a maximum of two comma space sequences and that once two have been included, the information should be separated by a space only. Kathy Massey also stated that when multiple titles apply, the titles are separated by a space only and that the set of titles are preceded by a comma and a space. The example provided by Kathy Massey is: Smith, John, Esq Dr Rev. Kathy Massey summarized the business rule as follows: For residence and business personal name listings, there is a maximum of 2 commas allowed. For residence and business personal name listings, there is a maximum combination of 3 titles, degrees and/or designations allowed. A third example provided by Kathy Massey is as follows: Smith, John III, Esq Dr Rev. *Mindy Diamond will verify if AT&T has coded to include a comma when the designation is used as a title of address.*	4/16/98	Mindy Diamond	CLOSED	04/29/98: No update has been provided. 05/04/98: Mindy Diamond verified that AT&T has not coded to include comma when the designation is used as a title of address. Mindy Diamond will be submitting an MR to address this issue. 05/12/98: Mindy Diamond stated issue can be closed. ISSUE CLOSED.
022	Mindy Diamond stated that she is "okay" with Section 4A, page 2, but that she has an issue regarding TN and PN. Mindy stated that all previous examples provided by BST had 2 /TNs and that we (AT&T and BST) agreed that if the listed TN is the same as the REFNUM TN, we don't have to pass the 2nd TN. Therefore, AT&T removed a /TN from	4/16/98	Kathy Massey	CLOSED	04/16/98: No update has been provided. 05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST should have a response by 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that Kathy Massey provided a

SUBJECT TO SECTION 18 OF THE GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE GEORGIA INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT DATED FEBRUARY 3, 1997,

BETWEEN AT&T AND BELLSOUTH

28

	one of the listings. Mindy Diamond stated that what was missing was the BST business rule that indicated it had to be written against the AC TN, but AT&T coded against the associated TN as previously required by BST. Therefore, the position of /TN is different from BSTs expectations. 1)*Kathy Massey will verify if the order is impacted when all the numbers we are dealing with are on 1 account. Kathy Massey stated that if they are on different accounts, the order will go into clarification. 2) Pat Rand will add an example to the business rules document depicting an AC on the same account. The example on page 2 shows establishing AC on separate accounts.*				response as follows: AC on a main account is not an issue if this follows the example given in the 4/16/98 walk-thru. If this is on a main account, Kathy Massey indicated this is not an issue. Stephen Travers will provide this response in writing after this conference call. Mindy Diamond will review this response before closing this issue. 05/06/98: Mindy Diamond stated that she would read BSTs documented response and provide her comments during the next call (5/8/98). 05/08/98: Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T is "okay" with BSTs response and that the issue should be closed. ISSUE CLOSED.
023	Pat Rand will update all examples to show the address with OAD as it will be provided by AT&T.	4/16/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/29/98: No update has been provided. 06/26/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Section 3 of BSTs business rules document (agreement #8) reflects BSTs agreement to accept both OAD and address. BST considers this ample documentation of the agreement and does not plan to update the EDI examples. ISSUE CLOSED.
028	Section 4A, Page 27 - Pat Rand will reverse/swap the TNs in this example. Also, this is a foreign listing and requires address. Pat Rand will add the address. Also, *Kathy Massey and Pat Rand will let AT&T know which address belongs in the LA field in this example.*	4/16/98	Massey and Rand	CLOSED	04/29/98: No update provided. 05/04/98: Mindy Diamond stated that this issue is related to issue 029 and that the FAC example lacks clarity. Stephen Travers stated he will provide BSTs response by 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST will respond to issues 028 and 029 together. Stephen Travers also stated that he expects a response from Pat Rand on 5/6/98. 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that these issues have been escalated from Jan Burris to Peggy Caldwell as no response was received within BST. Stephen Travers stated that BST does not

						have a date for a response at this time, but that he will provide an update tomorrow. 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that the DL business rules manual will be updated 5/26/98. 05/11/98: Stephen Travers stated that the exhibit will be updated to show the Atlanta, GA address as the appropriate listed address. Also, the telephone number at the top of exhibit should be 228-769-7916 in Pascagoula, MS. *Mindy Diamond asked if this means there is no /LA in the listed name field for Pascagoula and if so, this issue can be closed. Stephen Travers will forward question to Pat Rand this evening.* 05/12/98: Pat Rand stated that she updated the exhibit for the business rules manual and that we DO need /LA. Mindy Diamond questioned why the /LA was needed. Mindy asked the following questions of Pat: Why can't we do a comma and separation?, Why doesn't Pascagoula go in the listed address?, Why is BST asking for Atlanta to go in listed address when listed address is Pascagoula?, Why can't we put Pascagoula in listed address field with no reference to the Atlanta address?. Pat Rand stated that normally we don't have FACs going between different states in different directories. *Pat Rand stated she will check with Kathy Massey to be sure if the /LA is needed. Pat Rand stated she has already paged Kathy Massey and Tosha Ervin stated that she too would call Kathy Massey.* 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated the /LA is NOT necesssary as the order should be written against the Pascagoula, MS account. Tosha stated that BST will update the example to show that /LA will be removed. Mindy Diamond stated this issue can be closed. ISSUES CLOSED.
029	For AT&T assigned number orders, AT&T will send (OAD) on all AC and FAC listings and will insert the city and state	4/16/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED		04/29/98: Memo from Tosha Ervin stating BST will answer this issue by 5/1/98.

	on every FL listing. Pat Rand will test to verify if BST can extract the city and state where required.				05/04/98: Stephen Travers read a response provided to him from Pat Rand. In this response Pat referenced a 1/13/98 memo to AT&T. Mindy Diamond stated agreement with Pat's response, but also stated that this response does not address the issue. Mindy Diamond clarified that BST added /LA, one based on service address, one not based on service address. Today, AT&T sends OAD with the city and state. Mindy stated the requirement was that because the listing is FAC, BST needs city and state. The open issue/question is can BST pull the city and state from the LA field even with the OAD present? Mindy stated further that the city and state data are available in the appropriate EDI segment. Stephen Travers stated that he will check on this issue and provide a response by late 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that BST will respond to issues 028 and 029 together. Stephen Travers also stated that he expects a response from Pat Rand on 5/6/98. 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that these issues have been escalated from Jan Burris to Peggy Caldwell as no response was received within BST. Stephen Travers stated that BST does not have a date for a response at this time, but that he will provide an update tomorrow. 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that when the city and state are different from the End User or listed address field city and state, the CLEC must provide city and state. Mindy Diamond restated the open issue as follows: Does AT&T have to use /LA, or use the listed address and not reference the associated address. Linda Mull requested that BST include Pat Rand on these conference calls to avoid further delays in closing these issues. *Stephen Travers stated that he will see if Pat is available the 1st two days of next week (5/11 or 5/12) and would be able to join our calls to address open issues.*

					05/12/98: Pat Rand stated that she updated the exhibit for the business rules manual and that we DO need /LA. Mindy Diamond questioned why the /LA was needed. Mindy asked the following questions of Pat: Why can't we do a comma and separation?, Why doesn't Pascagoula go in the listed address?, Why is BST asking for Atlanta to go in listed address when listed address is Pascagoula?, Why can't we put Pascagoula in listed address field with no reference to the Atlanta address?. Pat Rand stated that normally we don't have FACs going between different states in different directories. *Pat Rand stated she will check with Kathy Massey to be sure if the /LA is needed. Pat Rand stated she has already paged Kathy Massey and Tosha Ervin stated that she too would call Kathy Massey.* 05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated the /LA is NOT necesssary as the order should be written against the Pascagoula, MS account. Tosha stated that BST will update the example to show that /LA will be removed. Mindy Diamond stated this issue can be closed. ISSUES CLOSED.
031	Section 4A, Page 31 - Pat Rand will update example to show (OAD) and full address (i.e., (OAD), address, city and state).	4/16/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/29/98: BST update not yet provided. 06/26/98: See input provided by Tosha Ervin on Issue 023. Tosha Ervin stated that Section 3 of BSTs business rules document (agreement #8) reflects BSTs agreement to accept both OAD and address. BST considers this ample documentation of the agreement and does not plan to update the EDI examples. ISSUE CLOSED.
032	Pat Rand will determine if AT&T can order stylist listings electronically and provide an example for business rules document of how to order stylist listings electronically. AT&T has coded such that for stylist listings, AT&T will float /PCN in the listed name field as follows: /PCN 335-BOAT.	4/16/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/29/98: Memo from Tosha Ervin stating BST will provide response to this issue by 5/1/98. 05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that the stylist listing orders are being tested today. Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to provide an update by 5/5/98. 05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to obtain the test

					results today (5/5/98). 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that these issues have been escalated from Jan Burris to Peggy Caldwell as no response was received within BST. Stephen Travers stated that BST does not have a date for a response at this time, but that he will provide an update tomorrow. 05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that CLEC ordering of Stylist Listings is "okay" and the issue can be closed. Linda Mull clarified that AT&T will be using the /PCN on Stylist Listings. Stephen Travers stated agreement with AT&T's process. ISSUE CLOSED.
033 X002	BST will provide a list detailing which list codes should be sent with AT&T assigned number orders for all listing types.	4/16/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	04/29/98: BST provided list codes. ISSUE CLOSED. See related issue #002.
034	Linda Mull will discuss AT&T using the /dgn on directory listing manual order forms with AT&T internally. This item is identified as a BST specific workaround. Another potential option for AT&T is to add another column on the IDF form to be used specifically for designations (Kathy Massey stated this was an acceptable option.)	4/16/98	Linda Mull	CLOSED	04/29/98: AT&T will be adding a column for /dgn on the manual form following the column for listed name. IDF specific date for completion not yet available. 06/17/98: E-mail from Marilyn Antal to Louise Del Monaco stating that the updated form is loaded and is ready for use. Linda Mull faxed a copy of the updated form to Tosha Ervin. ISSUE CLOSED.
035	Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T's center needs to update its M&Ps to handle changes to established captions and indented listings with the use of parentheses. Linda Mull will discuss these changes with AT&T internally.	4/16/98	Mull and Ervin	CLOSED	04/22/98: AT&T requested BST provide additional manual ordering examples depicting BSTs expectations. 04/29/98: Memo from Tosha Ervin stating existing examples showing the formatting and directory appearances of indentions and captions have been given and are valid. 05/01/98: Memo to Stephen Travers of BST stating AT&T does not question validity of existing examples, but rather, need additional detail to be able to order these listing types for the scenarios

					requested.
					05/04/98: Stephen Travers stated that he will discuss this issue with Kathy Massey tomorrow (5/5/98) and will provide a date at that time as to when BST will provide AT&T the examples requested.
					05/05/98: Stephen Travers stated that he is now using a different process to request information (examples) and that he should know tomorrow (5/6/98) when BST will be able to provide the examples requested.
					05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that he was given a date of 5/26/98 for delivery of the requested examples. Linda Mull requested that BST revisit this date as the examples do not require extensive work. Stephen Travers stated that he would revisit this date with Kathy Massey and provide a status on Friday 5/8/98.
					05/08/98: Stephen Travers stated that he has requested BST provide the examples by 5/15/98, but that he does not yet have a BST commitment.
					05/11/98: Stephen Travers stated that the requested examples are expected to be provided by 5/15/98. Stephen Travers stated that Tosha Ervin will work on the requested examples and will send them to Kathy Massey for approval.
					05/12/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST is on target to provide examples by 5/15/98.
					05/15/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST has made every effort to obtain requested examples. Tosha Ervin stated that BSTs position is that they have already provided these examples. Tosha Ervin also stated that BST has tuition based training available that AT&T could take advantage of. Linda Mull stated that BST has not provided the requested examples and that BST has not addressed AT&T's

					questions which are the basis for the requested examples. Linda Mull stated that in an effort to address AT&T's questions, she would provide examples and ask for BSTs concurrence on accuracy. Tosha Ervin stated she would take the examples back to BST. 05/20/98: Tosha Ervin will provide details by 5/26/98 as to what information and when the information requested by AT&T been provided. Tosha Ervin will provide detail on the referenced tuition based training for Bernadette Seigler and Kathy Taber. Linda Mull will provide the indented listing example to Tosha Ervin on 5/20/98 and Tosha will provide BSTs response by 5/26/98. 05/28/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Kathy Massey has the examples provided by AT&T and that she will attempt to get BSTs response date by 5/29/98. 06/02/98: Tosha Ervin stated that Kathy Massey approved AT&T's established captions and indented listings examples provided by Linda Mull. ISSUE CLOSED.
036	Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T's center needs to update its M&Ps to enable ordering two list codes (e.g., LN/NL, LN/NP).	4/16/98	Linda Mull	CLOSED	04/29/98: AT&T reviewing time necessary to implement these changes. 06/17/98: E-mail from Marilyn Antal to Louise Del Monaco stating KMS will be updated with the list codes. ISSUE CLOSED.
040	Linda Mull stated that AT&T is using and has numerous orders completed using the ACTivity codes of I and O. Linda Mull to determine if AT&T is sending the ACTivity codes of I and O (in and out) for listing changes, as opposed to A and D (add and delete) and will share the information with BST for determining next steps.	4/16/98	Mull and Ervin	CLOSED	04/29/98: BST requested detail explaining if AT&T is using I and O on manual orders only or both manual and electronic orders. Linda Mull confirmed (via voice message) with Tosha Ervin that AT&T is using I and O on manual orders only. 05/05/98: Linda Mull restated that AT&T needs BSTs confirmation that there is not a BST concern with AT&T using I and O on manual

					orders as instructed by BST. Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to provide a response tomorrow (5/6/98). 05/06/98: Stephen Travers stated that BSTs response is that they did not agree to I and O and will accept and not reject orders with an I or O. Linda Mull restated that BST provided the instruction for using I and O on manual change orders. *Linda Mull to fax a copy of the examples to Stephen Travers* 05/08/98: Linda Mull will forward copy to Stephen Travers. 05/12/98: Tosha Ervin stated that BST will accept I and O as ACT values on manual orders. 05/28/98: ISSUE CLOSED 5/12/98.
045	BST will provide the updated examples showing /LA removed concurrent with its 5/26/98 delivery of other business rules. (See closed issues 028 and 029.)	5/15/98	Pat Rand	CLOSED	06/17/98: AT&T reviewed 5/26/98 document (per Louise Del Monaco e-mail to Linda Mull). The examples appear to be correct. ISSUE CLOSED.